

PATENT



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RE APPLICATION OF : Timothy James Regan

FOR : **METHOD OF MODIFYING AN
INTEGRATED CIRCUIT**

SERIAL NO. : 10/018,867

FILED : December 19, 2001

EXAMINER : Laura M. Schillinger

ART UNIT : 2813

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE MAILED : February 17, 2004

CONFIRMATION NO. : 8474

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : UDLZ 2 00016

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10

"Express Mail" Mailing Label Number: EL 998017197 US

Date of Deposit: May 7, 2004

I hereby certify that the attached ***Issue Fee Transmittal Form, Issue Fee*** and ***Response to Statement of Reasons for Allowance*** are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Karen M. Forsyth

Express Mail® Mailing Label Number:
Date of Deposit:

EL 998017197 US
May 7, 2004

I hereby certify that this paper, and all documents indicated therein as being attached are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above, and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Issue Fee, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By:

Karen M. Forsyth



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S) : Timothy James Regan
TITLE : METHOD OF MODIFYING AN INTEGRATED CIRCUIT
APPLICATION NO. : 10/018,867
FILED : December 19, 2001
CONFIRMATION NO. : 8474
EXAMINER : Laura M. Schillinger
ART UNIT : 2813
ALLOWED : February 17, 2004
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : UDLZ 2 00016

RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Mail Stop Issue Fee

Dear Sir:

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, applicant respectfully submits the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "The record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2001)). In the present case, applicant believes the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicant's claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicant's responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicant believes the claims are allowable, applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

May 7, 2004
Date



Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582